

REMARKS

This reply supplements the reply by the applicant filed on July 24, 2006.

Claim 2

Regarding claim 2, in addition to the remarks by the applicant submitted on July 24, 2006, the applicant contends that claim 2 is patentable for at least the following reasons.

Reason 1:

Levy does not disclose and would not have suggested a data server determining whether the input URL provided by the authentication server is the channel URL that is of a set of URLs, each URL of the set corresponding to a web server that provides the contents of a predetermined subject, and if so, requesting the contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the respective URLs of the set, as recited in amended claim 2.

In claim 2, the data server determines whether the input URL provided by the authentication server is a channel URL. If the data server determines that the input URL provided by the authentication server is a channel URL, the data server requests the contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the respective URLs of the set.

By contrast, Levy discloses that the customer uses a computer 11 to access an information retrieval system 10 to chooses from among a list of accessible services and specifies the delivery schedules of the information services. Later, an information retriever/scheduler 15 retrieves information over the Internet and delivers the information to a cellular telephone display, a fax machine, beeper or an e-mail server associated with the customer according to user-specified delivery schedule. (Abstract, col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 5, col. 5, lines 5-24, and col. 7, lines 5-12) Levy does not disclose or suggest a data server determining whether an input URL provided by an authentication server is a channel URL that is of a set of URLs.

Moreover, in claim 2, requesting the contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the respective URLs of the set is performed if the data server determines that the input URL provided by the authentication server is the channel URL that is of a set of URLs. This is not

disclosed or suggested by Levy. In Levy, the system 10 requests contents from a plurality of web servers according to user-specified delivery schedules.

Reason 2:

Levy does not disclose and would not have suggested binding gathered contents into a single channel, as recited in amended claim 2.

As discussed above, Levy discloses a process in which the customer chooses from among a list of accessible services and specifies the delivery schedules of the information services, then an information retriever/scheduler 15 retrieves information over the Internet and delivers the information to a device of the customer according to user-specified delivery schedule. (Abstract, col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 5, col. 5, lines 5-24, and col. 7, lines 5-12) While Levy discloses gathering information and delivering them to the customer's device, Levy does not disclose or suggest binding the gathered contents into a single channel.

Reason 3:

Kahn does not disclose and would not have suggested a data server that processes received contents into a predetermined format, wherein the data server includes an image compressor to compress images if the received content includes image information, and a proxy unit monitors data transmitted by the web server, and when the contents transmitted by the web server include image information, calls the image compressor, as recited in claim 2.

Although Kahn discloses processing compressed data (col. 15, lines 51-56 and col. 21, line 14 to col. 22, line 34), Kahn's system does not monitor data transmitted by the web server and call an image compressor to compress image information when the contents transmitted by the web server include image information.

Claims 7, 20, and 23 are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 2.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/17/2006

Rex I. Huang
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906